

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

June 21, 2007

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review in the Redmond Planning Department.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Lee Madrid, David Scott Meade, Sally Promer-Nichols, Mery Velastegui.

STAFF PRESENT: Asma Jeelani, Planner; Gary Lee, Senior Planner; Nathalie Schmidt, Planner; and Dianna Broadie, Planner. Recording secretary is Julie Dahlem.

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide. Our procedure is as follows:

- A. Staff will give a presentation of the project to the Board.
- B. The applicant then has an opportunity to comment on the project. The speaker should give their name for the record and sign the sign-up sheet.
- C. After the applicant, others in the audience may comment, either in favor or in opposition to the proposal.
- D. After all comments are heard; the Board will discuss the project openly and may request comments or have questions of the Applicant.
- E. The Board members then vote to approve, approve with conditions or deny the project.
- F. If the applicant does not agree with the Design Review Board's decisions, they have the right to appeal and should contact the technical staff member.

RECORDING

The meetings are tape-recorded and the recording will be part of the official record of each case. It is important to identify yourself prior to speaking so that you may be included in the recording.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by the Chairperson of the Design Review Board Sally Promer-Nichols at 7:00 PM.

MINUTES

April 12, 2007

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MADRID AND SECONDED BY MR. MEADE TO APPROVE THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 12TH, 2007 AS PRESENTED. MOTION CARRIED (3-0-1), WITH ONE ABSENTION.

April 19, 2007

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. VELASTEGUI AND SECONDED BY MS. PROMER-NICHOLS TO APPROVE THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 19TH, 2007 WITH THE FOLLOWING CHANGE. MS. VELASTEGUI COMMENTED THAT ON PAGE 3, ITEM 5, REGARDING AN ESCAPE FROM A TOWER. THE HEIGHT IS 30' IN COMPARISON TO THE 3' RETAINING WALL. MOTION CARRIED (2-0), WITH TWO ABSENTIONS.

May 3, 2007

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MEADE AND SECONDED BY MR. LEE MADRID TO APPROVE THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING MINUTES OF MAY 3RD, 2007 AS PRESENTED. MOTION CARRIED (3-0-1), WITH ONE ABSENTION.

Ms. Promer-Nichols pointed out that the first order of business was to look at the Matador Restaurant as part of the Landmarks Commission. Members of that Commission were not present tonight, so there was no quorum. That discussion will have to happen during another meeting.

APPROVAL

L070222, Redmond Transit-Oriented Development

Description: Six-story mixed use building with approximately 322 apartment units and 12,000 SF of commercial space. Application includes administrative design flexibility requests to allow slightly smaller courtyard widths, slightly narrower drive aisles, and allow fewer private balconies than required.

Location: SE Corner of 161st Ave. NE & NE 83rd St.

Applicant: Dan Shieder

Staff Contact: Gary Lee / (425) 556-2418

Gary Lee, Senior Planner, mentioned that this application has been before the Board several times as a pre-application. The last time it came to the Board, the Board felt it was ready to come in for an application. The city's Technical Committee has also accepted this as an application, so it's ready for the Board's review and approval, if that's what the Board chooses to do.

Staff still has a few concerns. A review of the building elevations finds that the use of the hardy panel is still a little too prominent. Staff also finds the details of the cornice dentils are lacking. Staff wants to make sure these elements are applied around the building. Staff also finds the recessed areas for the retail space along NE 83rd Street is lacking a focal point. The staff says the brown color on the materials board was different than that which was included on the elevation. Staff finds that the lack of the balconies in the interior courtyard is something that should be addresses.

Staff is recommending the following: One, the building elevations should be revised to include brick in place of the hardy panel along the street fronts and where it wraps around from the street front. The elevations should more clearly identify where the dentils are being used so staff can verify that through the building permit review. Also, staff is recommending that the site and the landscape shall be revised to include a landscape feature or an art feature as a focal point in that courtyard area along NE 83rd Street. The staff is also recommending that the brown color used on the metal panel shall be slightly richer and deeper, more like a russet color, for example, and similar to the perspectives by RMA. The deviations that are being requested should be approved, including the following: a.) Allow a reduction in the minimum courtyard width from 55' to approximately 40', as shown on the plans presented. b.) Allow some of the units to have no balconies, or smaller balconies than required. c.) Allow the parking garage drive aisles to be 24' instead of 25.5'. Also, the staff is recommended that balconies should be included on the units that face the courtyard. The elevation on the far right shows no balconies on the façade on N.E. 83rd.

Ms. Promer-Nichols pointed out these concerns arose after a meeting with the mayor, which Mr. Lee concurred with. Mr. Meade asked about the hardy panel recommendations, and was told the hardy panel will change along 161st and N.E. 83rd Streets, but not on the interior property line. Mr. Meade asked about some of the brown colors. Mr. Lee mentioned there may be some suggestions proposed by the architect. Mr. Meade also asked about the dentils, and where they would be.

Mr. David Hewitt spoke on behalf of Hewitt Architects, the applicant. He refreshed the board's memory on this project and its elevations. He's proposing bringing the brick further up the wall. Hewitt says, money aside, brick is not an appropriate material to use where the staff is recommending, however. He says the applicant was encouraged by the DRB to make the project more permeable from the street and more transparent. That's why the applicant increased the glass areas and lifted the corners to give them a lighter, more delicate feeling. The applicant thinks a masonry element, i.e., brick, would work in opposition to that goal.

The applicant is asking the Board to understand that "hardy board" is essentially a smooth board that can be painted. There will be a texture applied to the board as well to make it look like the side of a house. There will be a strong horizontal nature to mesh with another horizontal plane. A heavier material like brick would work in contradiction. If anything, the applicant continues, that element should be neutral or vertical. The texture seems to work best with the horizontal. The applicant is proposing a stucco finish on those panels, which can be any color the board wants them painted. The applicant is looking towards a lighter color. There would be a fiberglass sheet over the board, then a stucco finish. The applicant says it's a durable finish with a nice quality to it, a neutral look that doesn't have a direction but does have a color.

Referencing the dentils, the applicant went back to some of the original thoughts on the project. The applicant says his first sketches were too timid, and should have shown more extension to the roof overhang. The applicant is trying to respond to the Board's suggestion to provide more vertical modulation in the building. Those elements are higher and brought out more in this design to provide them with a force and emphasis in silhouette. That overhang would be justified by some structural elements that tie back into the building. The applicant says they're not really dentils, not in offense to the staff. The applicant says these features would not be used indiscriminately. They have a role to play in emphasizing the higher masses.

The drawings have been revised, showing that the cantilever has been extended and is more prominent. The applicant is also proposing "out lookers." The idea is like on an old house, where you reverse the framing and pick up the eave. The elevations show the shadow line that would be created by that further extension. The applicant is suggesting 4' or 4.5' feet of overhang and a more frequent use of the out lookers to give that more texture as you look at the edge of the building.

The landscape plans, with apologies from the applicant, are contained in a small drawing. He says it's a small exterior space, and proposes two ornamental trees, a planter, and a bench in that space. It's across the street from the transit center, and people waiting for the transit center could use it. That function gives this area a sense of focus. The applicant doesn't want that area to become too fussy and overdone. The applicant says the Board's comments are good, and the applicant wants to give this area a scale element. The trees here would be small and delicate ornamental trees.

The brown color, slightly richer, is a change the applicant thanked the staff for. The applicant would like to make sure that color could be approved for that and for the brick without coming back to the full Board. The applicant says overall, his response is that the hardy board panels will have a stucco finish in a color that works with the composition of the building, yet still has a smooth, high-quality surface. He's also proposing the out lookers should be more frequent and the overhang should be more emphasized to get the people who walk by to understand the compositional idea of the building. The applicant wants to put in some ornamental trees and an elevated planter in the green space, and will adjust the color as needed to add some vibrancy.

The applicant mentioned the decks, and Dan Shieder, the developer, added his point of view. Shieder says he's looked into the decks. While it is feasible, the design of the courtyard shows how it would look in elevation. It's grayed out in one elevation. The brick element is at the base of that, and the applicant feels that with all the other balconies looking down on that courtyard, the design avoids a claustrophobic feel. But the applicant says the staff's suggestion in this area could be followed.

The applicant mentioned the landscape plan, which is not completely drawn out. The applicant also showed some drawings of the extended overhangs and the larger out lookers. The applicant says he'd address the issues the Board has with the building's profile rather than using more out looker expressions. He'd like to keep the out lookers in the higher plane.

The Board asked more about the landscape plan, and Kristin Lundquist, with Brumbaugh and Associates, landscape architects, responded. She mentioned not much has changed since the last meeting with the Board. The applicant has been working with Gary and the staff. The applicant believes the scale of the terrace faces, and the whole project, feels right. The plan is to create private patio spaces that lead to connector terraces and then, again, to smaller courtyards of a slightly different color. The applicant is looking at a three-color scheme for the paving in all areas over the private spaces, the connector-terrace space, and main patio. There would be a third accent color sprinkled through the main connector, which is a change the applicant has been working on.

The courtyard terrace will become more of a garden, to avoid the fishbowl feeling with buildings rising on either side. The applicant will use low planter edges and a nice layering of planting on the North side. There are some minor changes along the connector, coordinating some planting of vines along the garage, and placement of a trellis. There are a few shifts in the connections to that, and the applicant is still looking at previous paving options that were discussed before.

COMMENTS FROM THE DRB MEMBERS:

Ms. Velastegui:

- Likes the project, but has a question for Gary about the hardy plank. Is it placed around the building or around the facades in particular? She thinks the use of the hardy plank appears to be on the third level, but it's not clear if it's in the first and second levels. The brick appears to be going from the first into the second level. She likes the materials.
- Thinks the addition of the stucco instead of the hardy panel would be a good alternative, depending on the colors.
- Likes the changes for the stucco under the windows, in the windowsills, in all the building. The applicant agrees that the white barrier would be a little too much. Mery says that stucco look will add more interest to the building.
- Asked about the main color for the boards. The applicant responds that it's light gray, and adds that the windows drive the project. White and almond are possibilities for the areas around the windows. A subtle gray would provide a tone-on-tone relationship between the stucco finish and the window frame itself. The applicant says the inset could be a russet color.
- Mery would prefer some contrast, having the window frame in a darker color instead of being in the same area. That might provide more contrast to the project. The only contrast she's seeing now is the metal.
- The metal ridge, the applicant says, is the russet color, which needs to be warmed up, in the applicant's view, and he plans to work with staff on that issue. The applicant changed the "fields" of the building, so that each building has a slightly different color.
- The applicant adds that the rose color, the gray, and the slightly yellow provide the main field against the white windows, and provide differences between the three buildings. It's a slight difference and may not be visible during certain times of day. But it is there to differentiate the massing of the building.
- Mery adds that the roof edge should have a green color for contrast. The applicant agrees that a dark green color will be used, and metal brackets that hold up the overhang will have a dark, strong color as well.
- Mery would like to see some of the massing broken up in the NE 83rd perspective.
- Regarding using the brick in place of the hardy panel, Mery wanted to know exactly where that change would happen. The applicant showed it would happen on the second level, on the street front.
- She would like to see more of a connection between the interior and exterior courtyard, bringing 83rd street into the project.
- Item B, number 6, deals with the courtyards of Building A. Mery is asking about the balconies, and the applicant says he'll be adding some balconies. Mery is concerned this wouldn't work with the current floor plan. She doesn't think that's a big problem, however. She would like a better identification for Buildings A, B, and C. She's concerned about the size of the buildings.

Mr. Meade:

- Had one question about the stucco. Would it be a pre-finished stucco board? The applicant responded that it's a cement board with a fiberglass and stucco finish, but it is not a pre-finished board. The texture and color would be like stucco, but there would be no exposed fasteners.
- He asked if there were a variety of textures. The architect says yes, and that he would apply a finish and texture, and would prefer a sand finish.
- He's supportive of the stucco solution for replacing the hardy panel. He wouldn't like the pre-finished stucco panel, which can be too shiny. He agrees with staff on the color comments, which he thinks could be tweaked a little more. He's very supportive of the project.

Mr. Madrid:

- Doesn't like the hardy panel, but is okay with the stucco finish. Says it's hard to envision, because there's a lot of hardy panel on some of the elevations that could take away from the structure and the mass of the building.
- Fine with the "out lookers," and the overhangs.
- Has a concern about the ornamental trees in the courtyard area. Says it doesn't work for him, and he'd like to see something else, possibly a water feature and a small landscaped area.

- Fine with the color deviations and the staff deviations in the project.
- The balconies, if they were put in around the back of the courtyard, he's wondering if they would look like the balconies that are already there. Staff says it would look the same, and wouldn't be recessed.
- Mr. Meade adds the location would be opposite of the kitchen, and refers to A105. Mr. Meade says it would be a logical spot.
- Mr. Madrid would like people to enjoy the courtyard, and a better feeling of being outside.
- Mr. Meade said it would humanize that area with an improved green space. The applicant mentions there could be a Juliet balcony on the top floor, to give a texture to the railing.
- Meade would like the landscape plan to identify different colored pavers.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Doesn't have too much to add. Agrees with the applicant that the brick can be a little too much, and competes with the metal. She's fine with the stucco-face hardy board.
- She likes the larger out lookers, and likes that more of them have been added, with greater depth.
- She's hung up on the courtyard façade, but knows there's a lot of junk on the streetscape in front of that spot, meaning two bus stop shelters and two to four trees. She would like to see that façade look a little different, possibly add a planter coming out with one special tree between the windows.
- She is really leery of pulling anything into that space, because there are other things going on. When the applicant talks about a coffee shop, it's valid to have more floor space for eating outdoors.
- The applicant responds that this idea might break up the retail continuity. He asks if there may be a way to add some scale elements without inhibiting the ground plain and movement of people through the area. He believes that an eyebrow might be needed over the area, some sort of connection between the two wings, with a color element. Many on the board agree.
- The applicant would like to work overhead to add continuity, and examine the tree and bench idea. On a delicate scale, this could be a nice retreat area.
- Sally wonders if that might inhibit the project, too. The applicant says perhaps a different paving pattern could add a different ground plain and bring attention down to the ground. The applicant says his first choice would be to add an overhang to add continuity to the roof edge. He'd like to give the paving pattern more power than the sidewalk.
- The staff adds there should be a prohibition for landlords in the area, that if there will be an enclosure in the area, it should be a metal wrought-iron fence rather than temporary wood picket fences, which many on the board don't like
- Sally says she's comfortable with staff working with the applicant to fix up that space.
- Gary adds he didn't add a provision for the balconies, but didn't include it as a condition of approval.
- Sally likes the balconies, to humanize the façade. She's supportive of the project, and always has been.

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. VELASTEGUI AND SECONDED BY MR. MADRIS TO APPROVE L070222, REDMOND TOD, INCLUDING THE BUILDING, ELEVATION, COLORS, MATERIALS, LANDSCAPE PLAN, AND LIGHTING PLAN, FOLLOWING STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS, WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- **BUILDING ELEVATIONS FOR THE BUILDING PERMIT SHALL BE AT SCALE 1:8, AND SHOULD SHOW ALL PLANNING MATERIALS. THE APPLICANT MAY NEED ADDITIONAL DETAILS AT ONE QUARTER SCALE OR LARGER, EXACTLY AS STATED IN ITEM #1.**
- **THE BUILDING ELEVATIONS SHALL BE REVISED TO INCLUDE STUCCO FINISH IN PLACE OF THE HARDY PANEL ALONG THE STREETS FROM THE FACADES AND RETURN WALLS.**
- **BALCONIES WILL BE ADDED ON THE SOUTH END OF THE COURTYARD OF BUILDING A.**
- **SITE AND LANDSCAPE PLANS SHALL BE REVISED TO INCLUDE A LANDSCAPE OR ART FEATURE AS A FOCAL POINT IN THE BUILDING RECESS BELOW THE COURTYARD. THAT COULD INCLUDE SOME DIFFERENT PAVING NEAR THE SIDEWALK AND SOME EXTENSION OF THE ROOF CANOPY TO CONNECT THE TWO BUILDINGS, TO BE WORKED OUT WITH STAFF.**

- THE BROWN COLOR USED ON THE METAL PANELS SHALL BE SLIGHTLY RICHER AND DEEPER.
- THE BOARD IS GRANTING DEVIATIONS FROM THE FOLLOWING STANDARDS, AS REVIEWED BY THE BOARD ON APRIL 6TH, AS FOLLOWS.
 - a. THE BOARD IS ALLOWING A REDUCTION IN THE MINIMUM COURTYARD WIDTH, FROM 55' TO APPROXIMATELY 40' IN SOME AREAS.
 - b. THE BOARD IS ALLOWING SOME OF THE UNITS TO HAVE NO BALCONIES, OR SMALLER BALCONIES THAN REQUIRED, AS SHOWN IN THE PLANS.
 - c. THE BOARD IS ALLOWING THE PARKING GARAGE DRIVEWAY TO BE 24' WIDE INSTEAD OF THE REQUIRED 25.5' FEET WIDE.
- PRESENTATION OF MATERIAL INCONSISTENCIES
 - a. WHERE INCONSISTENCIES BETWEEN THE FLOOR PLANS AND ELEVATIONS ARE FOUND AFTER THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD HAS APPROVED THIS PROJECT, THE ELEVATIONS APPROVED BY THE DRB AT THIS MEETING PREVAIL.
 - b. IF, AFTER THIS DRB APPROVAL, THERE ARE ANY INCONSISTENCIES FOUND IN THE INFORMATION PROVIDED FOR THE ELEVATIONS, FLOOR PLANS, LANDSCAPE PLANS, LIGHTING PLANS, MATERIALS, AND COLOR BETWEEN THE PRESENTATION BOARDS AND THE 11" X 17" SUBMITTED DRAWINGS, THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AND THE REDMOND PLANNING STAFF WILL REVIEW AND DETERMINE WHICH DESIGN VERSION WILL BE FOLLOWED FOR SITE PLAN ENTITLEMENT.
- THE APPLICANT WILL WORK OUT WITH STAFF THE SEPARATE COLOR PAVERS TO DENOTE THE PRIVATE SPACES IN THE COURTYARD AREA, VERSUS THE PUBLIC AREAS.

MOTION APPROVED (4-0).

APPROVAL

L070187, Geneve (Willows Ridge) Condos

Description: Upgrades to existing multi-family buildings and parking covers, and four new parking covers.

Location: 8125 Willows Road

Applicant: Katie Oman

Staff Contact: Asma Jeelani

Ms. Jeelani spoke to the board about the project, now called Willows Ridge Condominiums, previously called Geneve Condominiums. This project came in as a pre-app, and the DRB liked what the applicant had. This is an existing 1980's development that will have a change in exterior, taking blue vinyl off and using a stone, metal, and cedar siding combination. There will be two new color schemes for their project. The board had concerns about landscaping the last time this project was presented, with barbecue and seating areas requested. The applicant was asked to improve the mailboxes and have new walls for the trash enclosure area. The applicant has completed that, and staff has received drawings for that. The building plan, tree removal plan, and landscape plan are before the board tonight. There are 122 trees on site, and the applicant plans to remove 35 trees out of that. The applicant will plant 148 trees, so well within the standard of 35% of tree reduction on site. The applicant will be adding some new plantings to the area. Planning staff recommends approval without conditions.

Ms. Velastegui asked for more background on the landscaping. The landscape architect, Jeff Skierka, responded. The idea is to resemble a ski lodge, like Park City or Aspen. Red plum trees will be taken out, as well as the blue vinyl siding, and locust trees, too. The applicant wants to take those out, and provide quaking aspens, which have light brown trees that flutter in the wind. The buildings should be softened between each other with trees light this. A mountain fir will be used near the meter boxes and garbage areas to block sight of those areas. 100 tons of boulders will be placed throughout to provide that mountain feel. In the meeting area, there will be a large mortar-set stone patio. In the middle of that, there will be a gas barbecue, fire pit, and sitting wall. The applicant says a small amount of trees will need to be taken out to provide this theme. All of the ivy will be removed, as requested by staff. Rhododendrons, which have been in place since the 80's, have turned into miniature trees and are not providing the desired

effect up against the building. Those plants will go to the perimeters, relocated there to create a more mature looking project. The applicant will add new lighting to the driveway, lighting the trees to provide a glow to the whole project.

The applicant added that the name has been changed to Willows Ridge to give it a more Western town feel, like Park City. The applicant is looking for color, liveliness, fitting in with the natural surroundings, sustainability, and integration with the regional context, too. The buildings around this spot aren't all that special, so the applicant is trying to focus more on the mountains. The applicant believes she is bringing more life to the area, and there's a lot of opportunity on the site. The inspiration comes from Park City and some European ski towns.

The applicant says the materials will be inexpensive, but will be used in novel ways. Hardy panel is considered, with stone as well, to soften the look. There will be a mix of clean edges and softer texture as well. The color schemes include wheat and sage. The cedar siding and stone, hardy panels, and metal offer some bright colors. The hardy panel is a drop panel, vertical wide boards with a narrow reveal, to provide a different look. The cedar is waxed, which gives it an earthy texture along with the stone.

There's been some work done on the awnings, and the materials will be lively and cool. The floor plans are typical and haven't changed much. There are new entry canopies, new siding, and upgraded interiors. Windows are also upgraded. The lodge, or rec building, matches the residential area, but has a slightly different look. The cedar and corrugated metal is present, too, which the Board has seen before.

The applicant faces some issues, including a dark stairway that might not make people feel safe. The rhododendrons are nice, but they're in the wrong place. The new entries have light, including skylights that provide light without power during the day. The landing extends out to allow people to see out from upstairs. There's a new canopy, and the color materials come to life around it. The path is opened up, so it feels more safe, secure, and inviting. The lodge patio includes a fire circle, new trees, and new landscaping. The barbecue was a staff suggestion, and the applicant ran with it. Some board members liked what they saw.

Mailboxes are in each building, and there will be social halls in the buildings as well. The roofs match the entry canopies; the piers match the signage for the complex and also the bases of the buildings. Recycling is on the outside of the homes. Sight signage is similar to before. There will be glowing lanterns to fit in with the new architecture.

The trash enclosures are clean, rugged, and reasonable. The new version helps bring the pictures to life. The new plantings are green, the existing structure is gray, and should provide good contrast. There are new gardens, new siding, and new materials to bring it all to life. At building C, the old and new trash enclosures will be very different. The view down the hill will provide a nice layering of the buildings, especially with the valley beyond it.

Staff mentioned that on the site plan, on the pre-application, showed there would be new carports built. Public Works reviewed the project, and because of utility easements, that cannot happen. So that change won't happen. The existing carports will stay. The new materials will match with the carports, but new carports will not be built.

COMMENTS BY THE DRB MEMBERS:

Ms. Velastegui:

- Has some questions about the materials. She likes the general feeling for the work, but is concerned about the cedar lap siding being a little dark. She wonders if it's the rendering of the cedar. The applicant says that's good point, but the light coming through the roof will make the siding look different.
- Mery points out the siding looks light gray in some areas, but it's dark in areas like the entryway. The cedar will be dark out of the sun.
- The applicant points out that there will be more light in the entryway now, and the pine soffits will be provide some more reflection.

- Mery says she likes the material, but she is concerned about the differences in color, especially in the canopy area. She says the first floor will be even darker if the canopy is extended out. Mery says the cedar might work on some buildings, but not on others.
- The applicant says that issue was studied carefully, and added daylight skylights to correct that problem. Mery says that will be very important, because the public entrance should have a feeling of being safe.
- Mery likes the wheat and sage colors.
- Says the location of the trash receptacles should serve two buildings, or possibly three buildings. The applicant agrees, saying they serve the neighborhoods. Mery wonders if that would be enough for the project. The applicant says that has been thought through carefully. Mery points out with 78 units, someone could put garbage bags in the stairs if the receptacles aren't close enough. She suggested perhaps adding more, because people don't like to walk.
- Mr. Meade added that pickup of trash could be increased.
- Mery is concerned about how the cornice would work with lap siding, due to a concern over water. The applicant says corner boards would be used, which is not indicated in the renderings. The applicant says beveling would be beautiful, but very exacting. Mery reminds the applicant that water can be an issue in places like that.

Mr. Meade:

- Asks if the core trim will match the cedar siding. The applicant says yes. He asks about the color of the cedar, which will be a little lighter than what's in the renderings.
- He likes what he sees on the sills in the rendering.
- He says, "Go do it." He likes what he sees.

Mr. Madrid:

- Likes the project, sees it as a bold and different look for Redmond. He hopes it's successful, and it's unique, fresh, and cool.
- He's concerned about signage, which will not be approved at this meeting.
- He'd like to lighten the tone of the cedar color.
- He asks if the windows are vinyl, which they are, according to the applicant. The trim will be determined by the signage situation. They will be painted, says the applicant.
- Doesn't have a problem with the entrance, but depending on the modulation of the building, he asks if the entrances may change. The applicant confirms all the entrances will be the same.
- Comments on the trash enclosures, saying that making those look better is a big deal for the Board.
- Points out that the carports should be upgraded to the existing façade, because that's not indicated in the plans.
- Wants to know where the rhododendrons will go. The landscape architect says those plants will go in the gaps in the current landscaping. About 54 rhododendrons will be relocated, which should add to the space.
- He likes the mail sections near the recycle bins, and is supportive of the project.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Is upset with the dark colors in the project, and wants it lightened up. That will make it more playful, to fit with the project.
- The red color in particular is an issue, on the metal parts. The applicant says she's open to change, and staff says it will work on that issue.
- Mery asks what the color is on the new entry canopy. It's a dark brown, the same as the trim color. The red color could be extended to the canopy, to connect with the project and become less dark and more playful. The same way the sage extends to the canopy could happen with the red, to bring in more light.
- Sally asks about the carports, noting that the spindly supports they have bother her. Those should be clad in cedar, in her suggestion. The applicant says boxing them in, in some way, would be easy to do.
- Asks if there's any consideration about the blank walls at the ends of the buildings. On building 2, that's a living room space, but asks if a window or two might be put in, within budget considerations. Even a small window, in some bedroom areas, might make sense.

- The applicant points out that a window is an option. The height of the buildings is being softened with some aspens, meaning the building is almost a backdrop for the aspens, catching some filtered light.
- Sally would still like to see windows in the project to improve livability of the units. That same comment came up during the pre-application.
- Likes the direction of the project and thinks it will be well-received. She likes seeing new life in the older buildings rather than tearing them down.
- Thinks the landscaping looks fine, though she knows in-filling plants on the project will be difficult. She suggests masses of things rather than one of each plant, to avoid things looking spotty. The landscape architect agrees with that idea.
- Mery has another question about a long façade without an opening, the red building, on the south side. That might use a window, as well, to bring in some light. The applicant points out that the south façade has paths adjacent to it, and parking, so it's not looking out on anything special. The focus was supposed to be on the fireplace and the interior. On the north side, the fire pit and other amenities change the focus on light.
- Mery points out it is nice to have natural light, regardless of the view. The applicant says light will be throughout the project, making it glow when the sun goes down.
- Lee asked the question about putting in windows, and the applicant says that could work.
- The condition of a window wouldn't be the same for each building, depending on the room on the other side of it.
- The applicant says adding windows on the end of building one would be difficult, providing no clear wall for the bedrooms. But on building two, that could work. The Board would like to see small windows at the very least, even in the bedrooms.
- The applicant will give the idea some thought.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MADRID AND SECONDED BY MS. VELASTEGUI TO APPROVE L070187, THE GENEVE CONDOS (POTENTIALLY RE-NAMED THE WILLOWS CREEK CONDOS) IMPROVEMENTS WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS, WITH THE STANDARD PRESENTATION OF MATERIALS INCONSISTENCIES:

- **THE CEDAR COLOR ON THE COLOR BOARD WILL BE LIGHTENED, WHICH CAN BE WORKED OUT WITH STAFF.**
- **THE EXISTING CARPORTS SHOULD BE UPGRADED TO THE EXISTING ARCHITECTURAL STYLE OF THE BUILDING, INCLUDING TRANSFORMATION OF THE SPINDLY SUPPORT ELEMENTS, WHICH CAN BE WORKED OUT WITH STAFF.**
- **WINDOWS SHALL BE PLACED ON SIDE ELEVATIONS AT EITHER THE ROOMS OR LIVING QUARTERS, DEPENDING ON THE ARCHITECTS' VISION, AND WHAT THE FLOOR PLAN ALLOWS. THAT WILL BE WORKED OUT WITH STAFF.**
- **THE COLOR, NUMBER NINE ON THE COLOR BOARD, SHALL BE MOVED TO MORE OF A RED COLOR, SOMETHING IN A BRIGHTER RED ON THE METAL AREAS.**
- **THE TRASH ENCLOSURES SHOULD BE GIVEN CAREFUL ANALYSIS, OR CHANGE THE FREQUENCY OF TRASH PICKUP, SUCH THAT THERE IS NO OUTSTANDING TRASH OUTSIDE THE ENCLOSURES.**

MOTION APPROVED (4-0).

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MADRID TO CLOSE THE MEETING. SECONDED BY MS. PROMER-NICHOLS. MOTION APPROVED.

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE070042, Bean Financial Advisors Office

Description: Addition of 210 SF office and reception space to the converted residential office structure and the improvement of the parking area in the East Hill District.

Location: 16640 NE 83rd Street

Applicant: David Wolter

Staff Contact: Nathalie Schmidt (425) 556-2471

Ms. Schmidt presented on behalf of the staff. It's an older residential building, a 1942 structure in the East Hill area. It's on the corner of 83rd and 167th, tucked behind Redmond Elementary. The applicant is

proposing to add a few hundred square feet to provide a new entry to the building. It's already been converted to office. That will involve changing some windows and raising the roof a little bit. Some dormers will be added to the conference room. All of these things seem to be in good keeping with the residential character.

The applicant is also changing their parking layout in the front side yard. The landscape plan was adequate for that, in the staff's opinion. There are pedestrian system improvements, and they appear to be as required.

The owner, Steve Bean, introduced himself. He's been a resident of Redmond for 30 years, and has a vested interest in improving the community by 209 square feet. Donald Wolter, with Wolter Design Group Architects, is the architect for this project. The parking lot has been configured because it's the only practical way to get four cars in and able to back out onto the street. The existing building is over the property line by about 15" on the north side, which makes for a very tight side. The owner says it's been so since 1942.

The goal is to add square footage and give the building a facelift. The applicant would like the building to have a little more prominence, and reduce the disparity of scale between this house and the apartments to the north. A photo of the existing house and the apartments shows that disparity. Raising the roof line should help fix that. The project is straightforward and small, from the architect's perspective.

COMMENTS FROM THE DRB MEMBERS:

Ms. Velastegui:

- Likes this. She misses the type of clean, simple presentations the architect has provided.
- She likes the linking of the two buildings, and thinks the architect did a good job.
- The proposal gives dignity to the building, and adds a lot to the area.
- Likes what's been done with the rooflines, and thinks the architect is going in the right direction.
- She will have concerns later about colors and materials.
- The applicant says he hasn't made the decision as to whether they'll use a brick or ledge stone on the project.
- Mery would support a stone product. The owner says he's trying to give the building a classic, older look, and he wants to enhance that older look.
- She supports the project, and says the project is going in the right direction.

Mr. Meade:

- Would like to see the next stage to see how dramatic the change in color and materials would be.
- This is an iconic building for Redmond, and says it's a charming piece of Redmond history that's really striking. He'd like to see that history retained.
- Sees how it's leaning towards being more functional, but wants to make sure the applicant is sensitive to what's there now, to enhance the history rather than depart from it.
- Likes brick, but says hedging could create the same formal look without introducing a new siding material.
- The architect admits this building does have charm, and wants to move it towards a more dignified character that would retain that history.
- Dormers are proposed, which the applicant says would give it a more grand appeal.
- The architect says the part where the dormers are proposed is a very low roofline, so the attempt is to elevate that so it doesn't look like a couple of garage doors.
- The architect says the right side of the building won't change, really, other than perhaps removing a few of the shutters on the end windows. The feeling on brick or stone would add a feeling of permanence for a financial planner.
- Mr. Meade says he loves brick, but would keep it close to the body color of the building. He'd like to keep the colors similar. He says this is one of the few buildings in Redmond everyone knows the location of, because of the open space right in front of it.
- Wants to retain the original character, and keep this punchy, classic color scheme. A light-toned brick might be best to make sure it retains that charming cottage look.
- The architect says he'd like to keep the black and white theme, and accepts what Meade is saying.

- Meade wouldn't want to change the color to black.
- The owner says the street improvements will require losing the big tree on the corner. The Board will try to prevail to save it. It's a hawthorne, a deciduous tree. Planning has some limitations in this regard.

Mr. Madrid:

- Asks how many shutters would be removed. The applicant says the shutters wouldn't be appropriate on the smaller dormers at the conference area. The east end will have shutters.
- Mr. Madrid asks if the framing of the windows will be bulked up. The applicant says no, he's just taking the shutters away and replacing the windows with new ones, single-glazed.
- Mr. Madrid says stone or brick would be fine on the base, just be careful on the color.
- Would be great to retain material on the site.
- Asks about the proposed fence, which the applicant says replaces the current fence, with a subtle elevation change from the sidewalk to the property. The applicant says it's not clear what material he'd use there, and Mr. Madrid asks him to think about it.
- Mr. Madrid asks about the landscaping, which will be substantial. But the large trees will remain, says the applicant.
- Mr. Madrid says it looks like a nice update.
- The applicant asks about a pedestrian walk from the entry to the sidewalk, and asks the Board about it.
- Mr. Meade asks if there's an accessibility issue, and the applicant shows a handicapped access on the side of the entry. Mr. Meade says an alternate paving pattern may be the answer to delineate the pedestrian path.

Mr. Meade:

- Asks about the south elevation, which shows windows on either side of the entry. They do not appear to be trimmed. The applicant says they should have trim to keep them consistent.
- Asks about a new roof, and if it will be composition-type material. It's cedar shake now, and when the applicant comes back, he will need a plan. Energy efficiency is an issue, Mr. Meade says, and that attic space should be buttoned up a little bit more.
- The applicant asks if the Board would support asphalt shingles. Mr. Meade says yes, if there's a solid 50-year shingle that's black, it would stay with the current style.
- Wonders how colors will be realized, and says an all-white plan wouldn't bring out the shutters. Suggests even painting the brick a black to bring back that look.
- Asks if keeping the entry cover more consistent with the gable details was considered. A new arched entry is there, and the roof corners are turned. Mr. Meade says something simpler and more in character with the building would be appropriate. The entry detail should borrow from what's existing to create something new.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Thinks it's a nice addition. Doesn't think there's a way to put in a pedestrian path, but says there are paving methods to show different pedestrian ways in and out.
- She's asking the board if the applicant needs to come back next before approval.
- Many Board members says colors will be important.
- After that point, the applicant can get a permit.
- Approval can't happen tonight.
- The architect agrees to follow the steps toward the final approval of the Design Review Board.
- Mr. Meade asks about signage for the project. Right now, there's only a sign on the mailbox and a plaque by the door. There is no walk-in traffic. All business comes by referral.

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. VELASTEGUI AND SECONDED BY MR. MADRID TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. MOTION CARRIED (4-0).

MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY